DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 748 UD 022 108

AUTHOR Underwood, Robert A.
TITLE Bilingual Education in a Developing Pacific Area: Why? Asian Pacific American Education Occasional Papers.
INSTITUTION National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 81
GRANT NIE-G-79-0063
NOTE 36p.; Not available in paper copy due to institution's restrictions.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, 1414 Walnut Street, Room 9, Berkeley, CA 94709 (write for price).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Chamorro; *Cultural Awareness; Developing Nations; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnicity; *Language Role; *Nationalism; Political Attitudes; Political Influences; Social Change
IDENTIFIERS *Guam; *Pacific Trust Territory (Mariana Islands)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relationship between politics, economic development, nationalism, and school language policy in the Marianas and Guam. Past and present developments in language policy and various rationales in support of bilingual education programs are reviewed. The author draws from Fishman's "Language and Nationalism" and Woodward and Inglehart's "Language Conflicts and Political Community" to support his arguments that (1) language difference does not promote nationalistic conflict in and of itself; and (2) while language is not a necessary component of nationalism, it does provide a link to ethnic and cultural authenticity. It is suggested that bilingual programs have been viewed as reconciling rising nationalism in the Marianas, concern over the loss of Chamorro ethnic and cultural identity, and pressures to learn English and assimilate into a dominant English speaking culture. The report concludes with the observation that in developed Pacific areas such as Guam, the use of language in schools is evaluated far less for its educational value than for its use in defining the essence of a society that is struggling for cultural survival. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212748

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN EDUCATION
OCCASIONAL PAPERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Underwood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
ASIAN AND PACIFIC AMERICAN EDUCATION

Asian Pacific American Research Seminars

UD022 108

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN A DEVELOPING PACIFIC AREA: WHY

Robert A. Underwood

Assistant Professor
University of Guam
Mangilao, Guam

1981

This paper was prepared for the Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, a project of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education.

The Asian Pacific American Research Seminars is supported by a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-79-0063).

Copies of this paper can be obtained from the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, 1414 Walnut St., Rm. 9, Berkeley, CA 94709. Write to this address for the list of publications and price list.

As with many other areas of the Pacific, the island of Guam and the rest of the Mariana Islands are undergoing a language and culture revitalization movement. This movement is being played out primarily in the schools of Guam, but is beginning to have appreciable effect on the nature of political rhetoric and educational operations in the neighboring, but politically separate, islands of the Marianas. In this struggle for cultural and linguistic affirmation, the major arena of activity has been the public schools and the major focus has been the Chamorro language.[1] Through a variety of rationales, bilingual-bicultural forms of education have been advocated, damned and implemented. While these proposals for the study of and use of the Chamorro language, both as a subject and a medium of instruction, may be examined in terms of their pedagogical implications or their linguistic appropriateness, such analyses would be incomplete and insufficient.

A far more fruitful approach would be an investigation into the political and social agendas apparently being pursued under the rubric of bilingual education. The zenith-like rise of concern over Chamorro in the hitherto English-only schools of the Marianas may be more of a political and social movement than the sudden recognition of an educationally valuable tool. This is not to say that there is no substance to the argument that utilizing the Chamorro language would not be a pedagogically sound tool for increasing pupil performance and achievement. However, pupil achievement is really on the periphery of the question of school language policy, despite protestations to the contrary. The spirit of support for Chamorro language education doesn't find its strength in linguistic or educational research. If anything, appeals to such research are frequently utilized only to the extent that they buttress existing notions about what Guam's political and social nature should be. In fact, political support of Chamorro language issues is sometimes articulated in a manner heedless of the most common linguistic sense.[2]

This growth of interest in bilingual education on Guam has both baffling and predicatable dimensions to it. In its operation, which is largely drawn from American bilingual education trends, the contrast between the reality of Guam's children and the rhetorical aims of the programs is glaring. Filled with ESEA Title VII terms from the U.S. Office of Education, the children of Guam are supposed to be lifted from their English deficiencies and limited chances of educational success through federally-spawned bilingual education.[3] Yet, the children of Guam are English-speaking and Chamorro, as a first language for the island's youth, is limited to an ever decreasing minority.[4] Although the linguistic characteristics of the Northern Marianas might more properly fit the typical rationale for bilingual education, Title VII simply arrived fifteen to twenty years too late for Guam. However, this does not prevent almost unanimous justification for bilingual education on the basis that it is necessary as a transition to a language of wider communication.

The reasons for this situation are clear and could have been predicted. They lie in the reality that the resurgence of Chamorro in Guam's schools is essentially a product of Guam's status as a developing society meeting issues it had not previously considered. The language question in the schools of the Marianas is at once a social, economic and political question. Language is being used as a tool to represent particular social and political visions. As such, the decision to use a Pacific language in a developing area is a much more complex question that contrastive linguistic analysis with languages of wider communication. We are dealing with a milieu in which what may be thought of as strictly linguistic concerns are frequently the last considerations of school language policy. The impact of a long colonial history, rapid economic development, increased immigration, growing nationalism and prolonged language loss makes language choice in Marianas schools clearly a statement of political and social vision.

There have been few attempts to offer analyses of the relationship between politics, nationalism and school language policy in developed Pacific societies. However, there are general dis-

cussions of the relationship between nationalism and language throughout the world. Two of these will be utilized to help analyze the Marianas situation. Fishman's Language and Nationalism (1972) and Woodward and Inglehart's "Language Conflicts and Political Community" (1967) can offer us some insights into how linguistic questions become volatile social issues. Based on these discussions, the Marianas situation will be examined.

In this attempt to understand what is occurring on Guam and the Marianas in school language policy, we will review past and present developments in language policy. We will also review the growth of bilingual education and the various rationales enlisted by educators to support the programs. By comparing these trends with the emerging nature of island society in the Marianas and the increased level of ethnocultural nationalism, we will see that bilingual education faces a troublesome future. Despite the fact that bilingual education now enjoys widespread support, its shouldering of political and social issues may prove to be too heavy a burden in the future. Bilingual education and the maintenance of a valuable human resource (the Chamorro language) may fail, not because it didn't provide children a sound education, but because it did not live up to its advanced billing as the major vehicle for ethnocultural salvation.

Framework for Analysis

The Inglehart and Woodward formula for understanding language in its political dimensions is a simple, but effective one. They hold that linguistic pluralism does not inherently create a politicized linguistic environment. In fact, they point out that there are many traditional societies in the world in which a number of languages co-exist without unrest. The oppression of these languages or even the existence of a privileged linguistic minority does not necessarily bring on conflict in policy formation. Conflict comes, as they explain it, in terms of two related situational factors. They are the level of economic and political

development and the extent to which "social mobility is blocked because of membership in a given language group".[5] In other words, language becomes a source of conflict in a linguistically diverse society when that society is undergoing rapid industrialization and modernization. The key point here is that society is in flux and that there are new expectations about economic and social mobility. If it appears that mobility in this situation is restricted on the basis of a language belonging to a dominant minority, then conflict will arise. If we assume that bilingual education has political overtones, and only a fool will maintain otherwise, then its fortunes might be dependent on the factors outlined by Woodward and Inglehart.

The two scholars also make the point that although assimilation of subordinate language groups may be the ultimate result, this does not preclude the emergence of language policies designed for bilingualism in the interim, transitional phases. Furthermore, within their framework, they allow for a multitude of types of political activity and do not presume to predict or categorize specific types of language policies with certain social situations. Of interest in their description of various kinds of activities is their conclusion that the utility or vibrance of a language is not a prerequisite for language policies. They argue that a few politicians may seize upon language as a vehicle for personal political power and that such was the case in many European situations. Language during the nationalistic fervor of 19th century Europe was not intrinsically the source for conflict. But it was a focal point for conflict since it provided a convenient weapon to differentiate between patriot and intruder.

The key point here is that language difference does not promote nationalistic conflict in and of itself. Far too many analyses of such questions seem to assume that political conflict that centers on language survives merely on the basis of linguistic differences without reference to other factors.

This overemphasis on the divisive power of language in politically volatile situations may lead to the assumption that conflict will cease once linguistic assimilation has taken place. Inasmuch as many of the European languages were dying or dead in the 19th century Europe (when linguistic conflicts arose),[6] such an assumption is an oversimplification. Language may be the stage upon which the conflict is played out, but the theatre is built on social and economic discontent.

Fishman's analysis of the nationalistic uses of language are also pertinent to this attempt to explain the dimensions of school language policy in the Marianas. In his Language and Nationalism, Fishman gives us an insight into the emotional and ideological dimensions of language. If Woodward and Inglehart explain how language conflicts may arise, Fishman describes how the conflict may be played out in developing societies with a strong nationalistic base. In his work, and for purposes of this discussion, the term nationalism is used to mean a feeling of ethnocultural unity and identity, not a movement for political and territorial independence. In applying this to the Marianas, we may say that Chamorro nationalism is widespread as an indicator of ethnocultural solidarity, but that relatively few have argued the desirability of organizing a Chamorro republic.

Fishman argues that language is used in a number of emotional and ideological ways by nationalists. By way of explaining this phenomenon, he points out that language is not inherently nationalistic. That is to say, language is not a necessary component of nationalism nor does it bring about a sense of ethnocultural loyalty, but it does simplify the nationalistic task. He argues that nationalism is a process of seeking broader unity and that this unity must be sanctified by a sense of authenticity. This authenticity can stem from references to a glorious common past. Without language, it is possible to build authenticity, but with language as the link to the glorious past, we have something more than just memories. The spoken word itself, the common language, becomes the bond and, by virtue of the fact that it is immortal (it transcends the indi-

viduals who use it), the ethnocultural authenticity takes on a supernatural air. We do not merely remember the past, we reconstruct it as a period for our ancestors who spoke with the very same words we now use. Moverover, in this re-ethnification process, language is not just one of several equally valid rationales. It becomes the major link with the past and our basis for feeling unique. Fishman writes that language in emerging nationalistic societies goes beyond "instrumental identification of community with language" and goes toward "the identification of authenticity with a particular language which is experientially unique."[7]

This search for nationalistic authenticity through language manifests itself through several linguistic behaviors. In what Fishman terms "contrastive self-identification" we may witness policy attempts to highlight that which is most linguistically pure and primitive. We have an emphasis on ancient and archaic forms and a deliberate attempt to root out foreignisms from the vernaculars. In fact, in many instances the nationalists suspect those who have become very glib in a second language as being untrue or inauthentic to the masses and to the nationalist cause

Language policy in such situations finds itself attempting to plan for authenticity while making the leap to modernity. Any organized pursuit of solutions to language problems in this context may generate what appears to be irrational and contradictory behaviors. Fishman makes the cogent point that those who highlight contradictions in nationalist language planning fail to recognize their own outside perspective and may also miss something very crucial.[8] Contradictions in language planning, as perceived by the nationalists, are "an inevitable dialectic that serves merely to test the strength and the faith of the faithful."[9] Any attempt to wed ideology and reality is bound to leave us with some discontinuities in our perception of social processes, but to ignore and deride ideology is to misunderstand the creative forces which abound in all societies.

Development of Guam and the Marianas

Guam and the Northern Marianas are presently separate political entities that have distinct relationships with the United States. At first glance, this political separation appears to have some social and economic justification inasmuch as the two areas are at different stages of development. However, upon closer examination, we find that whatever route Guam has taken in its development, the rest of her sister islands in the chain seem insistent on doing the same. Moreover, the speed at which changes are made in the Northern Marianas appear to exceed Guam's rate of change when it was undergoing the "boom" of the late 60's and early 70's.

Originally, the Marianas were populated by the Chamorros when the Spaniards first visited the islands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Chamorros and their predecessors came to the Marianas over four thousand years ago. These original inhabitants of the Marianas developed a culture not unlike those found in Western Micronesia and naturally brought their language with them which we now call Chamorro.

The Spanish used Guam as a way station in the lucrative Manila Galleon trade between the Philippines and Mexico. It wasn't long before missionaries visited the island and asked permission from the Spanish throne to organize a mission for the Marianos or Indios as the Chamorros were then called. Father Diego Sanvitores was the first Westerner to settle the Marianas when he arrived with his fellow priests and soldiers in 1968. Along with the missionary spirit came the inevitable wars, diseases and reduction in population. The Marianas were baptized not only in the faith of the Western world but in its ways as well. The Chamorros had the dubious distinction of being the first people of the Pacific to endure colonization by the West.

Many cultural changes were foisted on the people and the Chamorros were Hispanicized to such a degree that they no longer

appeared to be Pacific Islanders, at least to the outsiders. Names, habits, customs and traditions were altered. However, the language remained and it became the unifying thread of the people of the Marianas to their identity.

The islands went their separate political ways through the machinations of colonial powers. Guam was seized by the Americans in the Spanish-American War of 1898 as part of its emerging Pacific empire. The rest of the Marianas was sold by Spain to the Germans in 1899. The Japanese subsequently took the islands as a League of Nations mandate after World War I as part of its reward for declaring war on the Germans. In the meantime, Guam was governed by the U.S. Navy as if it were a naval vessel and all its inhabitants crewmembers.[10]

Although there was much economic activity in the Northern Marianas prior to World War II, very little directly involved or benefited the people in the Northern Marianas. Guam was simply stagnant under the U.S. Navy and failed to move either economically or politically. Consequently, both Guam and the Northern Marianas were relatively in the same state of affairs socially, culturally and economically at the conclusion of World War II.

However, because Guam was a territory of the U.S., rapid changes were in store as the U.S. became embrioled in the Cold War. The island became a supermarket of military hardware and personnel. In a period of one year, 21 separate military installations were built. The people were declared U.S. citizens in 1950 by the Guam Organic Act and the island began to change its cultural direction under the direct impact of increased contact with outsiders.

More dramatic changes came in the late 60's after a change in local government leadership resulted in policies designed to promote economic growth. These policies increased immigration and population pressures accordingly. From a base population of approximately 60,000 in 1960, the island grew to 105,000 in 1980. Of this population 61% were Chamorros and the second largest group was Filipinos with 21%.[11] The birthplace of mothers of

children born in Guam reveals some threatening figures for those concerned with Chamorro survival. In 1970, 2,875 children were born on Guam and 1,464 of these babies had mothers from Guam. In 1979, only 1,271 out of 2,797 babies born on the island had native mothers. Viewed another way, since 1973, less than half of the children born on Guam have Chamorro mothers.[12] On the other hand, Filipino births on Guam increased 469% from 1963 to 1972.[13]

The economic changes reveal some impressive statistics that can be misleading. In 1964, gross business receipts on Guam were $124M and in 1979, they rose to $977.848M.[14] However, the hidden dimension to these changes on the island are the income cleavages which increase annually and have never been so blatant in the island's history. It was reported in 1979 that 36% of all Guam families had incomes over $20,000 and 21% had incomes of less that $7,000 per annum.[15] Clearly, a discomforting economic and social pattern has emerged on Guam. Economic development has brought with it increased immigration and economic disparity. Moreover, the common perception was that very little of this movement was benefitting the original inhabitants. The entrepeneurs and managers in the private sector were largely off-islanders.

To complicate matters, the immigrants on Guam were generally not of the "huddled masses" variety. They came to Guam in response to economic conditions with professional and technical skills far exceeding those of the native population that economic development was supposed to benefit in the first place. This results not only in the Chamorros being on the wrong end of change, but has let to a tremendous rate of out-migration. Recent figures from the 1980 report that 32,000 "Guamanians" live in the States.[16]

English in this changing island society is advertised as the gateway to economic success and its role as a means of upward mobility is continually asserted by businessmen, English teachers

and school counselors. The fact that Korean and Filipino engineers and doctors don't seem to know English very well doesn't alter this perception of English as the sure road to economic success. The importance of English has been stressed for so long, that its role as a gatekeeper to success is both psychological and real.

The development of the Northern Marianas has not been as spectacular, but it appears now to be on a path similar to that of their city cousins from Guam. The group was part of the U.N. Trusteeship assigned to the U.S. following the Pacific War. Unlike the rest of Micronesia, however, U.S. military activity (much of it covert) and control was of major importance in the 40's and 50's. Eventually, it became a district in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T.T.P.I.), a status the Northern Marianas always seemed uncomfortable with. They just didn't seem to fit the Micronesian mold.

Interest in re-integration of the Marianas, which meant joining Guam as a U.S. territory, ran high in the mid-60's, but was soundly defeated in the Guam voting of the re-integration referendum. Finding itself rejected, the Marianas Legislature sought a separate arrangement with the U.S. from the rest of the T.T.P.I. (and from Guam). Asking for status talks in April, 1972, a final covenant for the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas was completed in 1977. Under the negotiated arrangement, the commonwealth came into being a January 9, 1978. For most purposes, this arrangement is similar to that of Guam's.

Economically, the northern islands began their boom in the mid-70's. In the past few years, Saipan has witnessed the construction of five major hotels. The same pattern as that of Guam has emerged in that widespread economic disparity is now the order of the day. It is true that the poor are relatively better off than the poor in previous years, but the vast majority of the economic benefits go to the absentee investor, the new resident or to the

handful of native politicians or landowners. The expectation of economic benefit and social mobility is, however, widespread and closely tied to the common perception of what their U.S. citizenship status means.[17]

As with Guam, economic growth has been associated with an increase in immigration. The total native population of the Norther Marianas is approximately 16,000 so that any sudden shift in immigration patterns can be even more disastrous that on Guam.[18] Even with the Northern Marianas government ostensibly controlling immigration in its own interest, there are a reported 2,000 illegal aliens on Saipan. Moreover, approximately one of every four Saipan residents on the island is not a native.[19] This has been a phenomenon of the 70's.

Of course the same message about the economic utility and necessity of English is transmitted to the young people of the Northern Marianas. Additionally, it is transmitted by the same agents as on Guam (stateside buisnessmen and the educational institutions). With rising expectations about social mobility, the use of English as a gatekeeper will have enormous policy ramifications. If the average person believes that membership in an ancestral language group automatically gives others a head start on mobility, then increased consciousness about language issues is the inevitable result.

Although, at different stages of development now, it is clear that both Guam and the Northern Marianas are moving in the same direction. Both are territories of the United States and both are developing economies along similar lines. Lastly, both are facing the possibility of being outnumbered and displaced in their own homelands.

Past Language Policy

The language policies of governments in both the Northern Marianas and Guam have historically been very anti-Chamorro. Beginning with a Spanish colonial policy that dictated that a

knowledge of Castellano be a pre-requisite for government employment in the 1790's, the Chamorro language has been under near continual attach from external and internal sources. In fact, many have commented that "by all the rules of history and linguistics it (Chamorro) should no longer exist."[20]

Spanish language policy was based on the simple assumption that individuals who could be educated would eventually find themselves in contact with the refined language of the Castillian. Of course, notions regarding universal education were tenous even in the peninsula and rarely expressed, let alone, implemented in the crumbling empire. Consequently, Chamorro survived because there was no widespread formal educational challenge to it. This was not the case with other colonial powers.

The Spanish priests did use the language, but naturally promoted Castellano as the refined and significant language. Paradoxically, the priests later became the agents of language maintenance when Spain left the scene. Although Guam fell into the hands of the Americans, the Spanish Capuchins still managed the Church. Unable or unwilling to use English in catechism and sermons, and Spanish now having little social or economic utility, Chamorro became the language of the Church. The Spanish priests frequently had Guam children reading the catechism in Chamorro before the U.S. Navy schools would have the opportunity to extol the virtues of English.

When the U.S. Navy arrived on the scene, they seemed determined to not merely teach English, but to offer it as a substitute home language.[21] The Navy unabashedly maintained that Chamorros should speak English "habitually" to their children and frequently charted educational achievement in terms of how little Chamorro was being used.[22]

The attack on Chamorro was justified on the basis that mere knowledge of the English language would bring on economic progress, moral rectitude and social cleanliness. In one statement charac-

teristic of this hysteria over the necessity of English, education officials wrote in 1925,

> "English will bring to the people of Guam through the public schools a knowledge of sanitation and hygiene, which will enable them to live in a correct manner . . . along with such increase (population) will come further and enforced (sic) economic development. With economic development will come more of the real pleasures of life. Through English will come a knowledge of fair play and a keen sense of honor such as the progenitors of Americans had at the time of the origin of the language."[23]

Administrative restrictions and laws were developed to enforce this English mania. These included not only a ban on Chamorro in schools, but in government buildings and in the presence of military personnel. Chamorro was not merely viewed as an impediment to learning, but as a stumbling block to efficient government and good social order.

In the Northern Marianas, the experience was gentler under the Germans, but somewhat similar to Guam's Navy experience when the Northern islands were under the Japanese. All children who attended schools during German times were taught in German insofar as possible. With the Japanese, study of the colonial language itself occupied 50% of instructional time for the three years of schooling required of all children.[24] Native language instruction was non-existent.

Subsequent to World War II, the language policies, particular in schools, were dissimilar in the two areas. Guam's schools continued to view the Chamorro language as an enemy of education and did not alter this linguistic viewpoint despite the institution of a locally-controlled civilian government 1950. Americanization and the promotion of English continued on through the aegis of contract teachers whom a leading Pacific linguist called "twentieth century versions of the nineteenth century colonialists."[25] School policy in this matter was sanctioned by Section 3000 of the Government Code of Guam, one of the first laws passed by all-Chamorro

legislature. It reads that English is the official language of the Territory and forbids government employees from speaking other languages at work. There was very little objection to this language stance and, in fact, Chamorro was viewed as being not only inferior, but hardly even a language.[26]

In the Northern Marianas, Chamorro was used as a language of instruction under the suddenly enlightened U. S. military administration following World War II. Although it was used only as a gentle bridge to the English language, there was not the wholesale rejection of Chamorro by the local elite (colonial or native) which was common on Guam. Under the impact of increased funding from the "concerned" liberal Kennedy administration in the 60's, there was a shift towards English as the medium of instruction in schools. English subsequently became the end-all of education.

As the 60's drew to a close, both Guam and the Northern Marianas had school language policies which were clearly assimilationist. Both areas had endured attacks on their native language which were supported by powerful outside institutions. However, Chamorro had not yet disappeared, and only on Guam did a pattern of language loss begin to manifest itself. The local elite had raised their children using English and the rest of the population was following suit. Despite these linguistic imperialist policies, little opposition was ever in evidence.

To place these past developments into proper perspective, it should be recognized that although the original agents who advertised English as the vehicle to success and progress were Americans, they

didn't need to be present in large numbers to maintain that message. The institutions that were transplanted to the islands were seen by both the local populace and off-islander as intrinsically carrying that message. At the time of their organization as institutions and in their operations to the present, the English message is seen as a natural and logical component part of all educational and economic institutions. There has never been a counter-message within the historical experience of the Marianas.

Development of Bilingual-Bicultural Education

Into this linguistic and educational history of the Marianas entered the concept of bilingual education. The original impetus for the funding of these programs came from ESEA Title VII funds of the U. S. Office of Education and its rationales are affected accordingly. The U. S. O. E. had defined bilingual education as the use of two languages, one of which is the native language of the child and the other English, in a program of instruction. The conditions are that the native language is used only to the extent necessary to promote fluency and competence in English.[27] Although this is the accepted educational explanation, the common perception of bilingual education in the Marianas is any program with any Chamorro in it, including those which teach it as a second language.

The first bilingual program in the Marianas was organized on Guam as the Kolehion Mandikike' Project. In its very first brochure released to the public in 1971, the program was advertised as being "designed for children whose dominant language is

Chamorro." It also discusses (in Chamorro) certain linguistic attitudes existing at the time and, interestingly, says that "it is a good thought" to teach English at home as a first language since English is the language of the schools and offices.[28] In a prospectus about the program issued later on in the year, the program is justified on a "belief that pupils who use their predominant language in school will learn basic language art skills more rapidly."[29]

This perspective of bilingual education as being transitional in style and as a vehicle to raise pupil achievement in English has continued to the present in all of the funding proposals submitted to U. S. O. E. for Title VII funds. In the latest Guam proposal for K-9 project last year, the proposal writers go to great lengths to show that there is an inverse relationship between high percentages of Chamorro enrollment and pupil achievement in Guam's schools. It points out that 55% of all students in the target schools are in stanines 1, 2, 3 in standardized test scores. To highlight the depths to which Chamorro students apparently have fallen, the proposal reader is reminded that the children are low income to boot.[30]

This is not meant to deride the rationale for transitional bilingual education, but aside from the initial brochures and yearly proposals for funding, bilingual education on Guam is not being sold or accepted locally as a sound educational program to meet linguistic needs and problems. Instead, it is clearly an attempt to bring Chamorro into the classroom by any means necessary, even if it takes advertising one's self as a linguistically and

socially disadvantaged group. While this phenomenon may be a practical necessity to some, others see it as another example of federal insensitivity.

Moreover, there can be little justification of bilingual education on Guam as a transitional program. In a study of language use on Guam in 1972, ironically sponsored by the bilingual program, it was pointed out that for the past 20 years Chamorro bilinguals under 30 years of age learned Chamorro as a second language. Furthermore, the incidence of English monolingualism among the very young was on the increase.[31] A University of Guam linguist pointed out the same year that based on her research there is no longer any "need" for bilingual education. Instead she suggested the development of a "bidialectical/bicultural program with the speaking of standard English as its goal."[32]

However, any criticism that bilingual programs are inappropriate and do not match their own state reasons for existence will fall on deaf ears locally. For the majority of politicians, parents and children who come into contact with the bilingual program, the program is obviously built to revive Chamorro, give it some respectability and provide an educational outlet for ethnocultural cartharsis. Beginning in 1972 and to the present, brochures and other public materials emanating from the bilingual program speak of saving "our" language and frequently print poems which emphasize emotional links to the great and peaceful past. Language is the link to this glorious past and it is argued that by maintaining it, "our" greatness can be somehow transmitted.

Sometimes, the description of the program as being designed to promote English skills (written in English) is sandwiched between such poems (written in Chamorro).[33]

A clear indicator that the gap between the educator rhetoric of bilingual education and the social dimensions which underlie it can be found in the lack of enthusiasm for expanding bilingual education to non-Chamorro groups. Buried in the files of the Department of Education are the recommendations generated from an evaluation of the first bilingual project on Guam. The Northwest Regional Education Laboratory recommended that Guam institute programs for Ilocano and perhaps Vietnamese-speaking children.[34]

Such programs would be likely perceived as a perversion of bilingual education, since it has been identified, advertised and accepted as a kind of Chamorro revenge on the public schools.

To highlight further that bilingual education is really a part of a re-ethnification process rather than a strictly utilitarian educational endeavor are the development of other Chamorro-oriented educational programs. The Chamorro Language and Culture Program (CLCP), funded by ESAA Title VII from the U. S. O. E., began in 1973 and spread rapidly to 16 of the island's 28 elementary schools. In the intermediate grades (4-6), its avowed purpose is to "revive, maintain and allow students the opportunity to acquire knowledge of the language and culture of the people of Guam and the Mariana Islands."[35] Over 4,000 children participate in this program. It grew from a funding level of $295,000 in 1973 to $585,000 in 1977.[36] Its stated rationale is clearly language revival, but interestingly it still argues its point with an eye to current American trends. The CLCP emerges as an ethnic

heritage project that subscribes to pluralistic notions and speaks of the need for respect of diversity in our society. Clearly, however, the CLCP represents an extension of bilingual education into revivalist frontiers, but does so within the framework of American cultural pluralist rhetoric.

Politically, the Island's structure has been supportive of these endeavors, but not on the basis on linguistic need or even a cultural pluralist philosophy, but on the basis of ethnocultural solidarity or latent nationalism. In 1974, the Guam legislature passed P. L. 12-132 which made Chamorro an official language of the island, but not for purposes of official recordings and papers. One is led to wonder what exactly this official status means if it isn't for official acts.

Of more significance is P. L. 12-31 passed in 1973. This law authorizes the establishment of bilingual programs primarily on the basis of maintenance of Chamorro language skills, despite the fact that it was for the purpose of legitimizing the existing Title VII project (ostensibly designed to upgrade English skills). Interestingly it limits the authorization of bilingual programs to those which "emphasize the language and culture of the Chamorro people." There clearly was no acceptance of bilingual education as a valuable linguistic response to the needs of non-English or limited English speaking children who come from non-Chamorro backgrounds.

Two years later the legislature had another bill which mandated the development of instructional materials to reflect

the multi-ethnic social structure of the island. This measure appeared to be in keeping with the pluralist fad hitting the U. S. mainland and was similar in tone to some of the points made in the CLCP proposals for federal funding. Bill No. 358 had a short life inasmuch as it was quietly silenced.

This did not prevent any further political activity in the school culture and language policy. In fact, the most significant measure was signed into law on July 16, 1977, as P. L. 14-53. More commonly known as the Chamorro language mandate, the government of Guam now commits itself to teaching Chamorro to all students in Guam's schools in grades K-6. In the secondary schools, it becomes optional. Indicative of the emotion attached to the measure was the fact that all 21 senators quickly co-sponsored the measure and it was signed into law rapidly.

It did engender some debate in the public, primarily through letters to the editor, but no politician has even questioned it. Interestingly, when the bill was heard publicly, the lone testimony against it came from the first bilingual project director on Guam. She felt that Chamorro language courses should be voluntary rather than mandatory.

This growth of support is phenomenal when one considers that in 1974, when Chamorro was being considered as an official language, debate was extended and it took several weeks to get sufficient support to pass it.

Popular support in Guam's larger society was also manifested by a widespread Chamorro consciousness. Attitudes towards language and culture shifted significantly in the 70's even if the

people's day-to-day behavior did not match the increased expression of concern. That is to say, despite the praise of Chamorro, there has been no appreciable increase inthe use of Chamorro. Indicative of this concern is the conclusion of a major study on cultural change conducted on Guam in 1973. The researcher, Cornelius VanDer Poel, suggests that younger people are demanding more support for and from Chamorro culture. In this phenomenon, the younger people generally have a more idealized perception of Chamorro culture and express their notion of ideal behavior as being synonymous with traditional behavior.[37] In keeping with this perception, the younger generation is more resentful of outside influences and the cultural changes being wrought on the island than the older generations who ostensibly suffer more from it.

Language is viewed as a major carrier of traditional authenticity and upon it is placed much of the burden of group survival in a political and social sense. A very popular education consultant among bilingual teachers encapsulated the sentiments of many on the island when he stated, "Guam with an impressive mixture of languages is in the middle of a language revival which may lead to the liberation of the Chamorro people."[38]

The liberating qualities of Chamorro and its role in ethnocultural solidarity were further expressed in the Government of Guam Development plan released in 1979. In the document, written by a handful of young Chamorros in the Bureau of Planning, it was argued, that

> "Nothing is a clearer indicator of the tortured yet triumphant history of the people of Guam than the

record of change which has surrounded the Chamorro language. Although the language has changed, it has remained the people's clearest link to the fact that they are Chamorros."[39]

Increased concern over language issues seemed to go hand in hand with the economic and social changes that occured on the islands in the 70's. Moreover, involvement in political activities which were nationalistic seemed to attract many of those working in bilingual projects. A 1978 demonstration against the Pacific Daily News English-only language policy was led by a group called Peoples Alliance for Responsible Alternative (PARA). The group consisted primarily of individuals involved with bilingual programs in one capacity or another through the years. A similar language protest against the Saipan and Guam airports was also led by those involved in bilingual education.

The same group was also involved in a letter-writing campaign, media-exposure effort and the successful defeat of a local constitution which recognized U.S. sovereignty over Guam. In fact, during the bitter campaign over the constitution, pro-constitution supporters charged that the anti-constitution people were "bilinguists who were buying time for independence."[40]

Such charges of a politicized environment surrounding bilingual education are not inaccurate, nor should they necessarily be construed as an unhappy state of affairs. Given the nature of the society which produced the program and the forces which sustained it, it would be woefully naive to expect linguistic

research to be at the forefront of the Chamorro education movement.

In the Northern Marianas, the development of bilingual education has followed similar although not identical lines. In 1971, the first federally-funded bilingual project began on the island of Rota with funding from ESEA Title I. It was justified on the basis that the transition to English would be facilitated by instruction in the native language. The rest of the Northern Marianas saw a bilingual project funded by ESEA Title VII instituted in 1975. On the basis of this funding, all schools have bilingual programs either in English/Chamorro or English/Carolinian at grades 1-4 and 1-3 respectively. All are justified on the basis that they facilitate transition to English.

However, unlike Guam this rationale is applicable in that the children do come to school knowing primarily Chamorro. Vernacular instruction in this situation is not a matter of ethnocultural solidarity. It is a matter of common linguistic sense. Also unlike Guam, this "transition" rationale is appealing to some politicians. Many members of the Northern Marianas Chamorro elite wish to limit the role of Chamorro in the schools under the assumption that Chamorro will always exit.[41] As a result, political support of bilingual education as a vehicle for ethnocultural solidarity is not as widespread as it is on Guam although it does exist. This could be because the threat of "non-locals" dominating the island is not as developed or as clearly preceived as it is on Guam.

However, this does not prevent the individuals who work in bilingual programs in the Northern Marianas from seeing their programs as vehicles for ethnocultural survival. They tend to be very nationalistice as evidenced by their interest in organizing sócial action groups similar to those found on Guam.[42]

Political Ramifications

Basically, there are three socio-political points which can be made about bilingual education and the rise of Chamorro in the Marianas. The first is that the programs are a response to ethnocultural nationalism which is on the rise in the Marianas. Concern over the loss of Chamorro cultural identity as a result of economic and demographic changes is dealt with ambivalently by local politicians. Unwilling to deliberately turn the direction of the islands around, but still finding the present situation discomforting, the islands' leaders feel that some sort of cultural and linguistic action is necessary. Bilingual education and its various forms have become the arena for sociopolitical action by these concerned individuals. The major difficulty with identifying bilingual or Chamorro language education with a nationalist perspective is that the educational programs are generally not part of a larger nationalist policy. The programs themselves are frequently the entire focal point of language and culture policy when they should be part of a general strategy of political action to meet cultural and linguistic changes brought on by economic development.

Secondly, bilingual education then becomes the vehicle for solving the psychocultural problems of change for individuals. In response to the enormous changes being wrought by the economic and political scene and the problems of personal integration which may arise from them, the individual gets these educational programs. What we have here is the height of educational egotism. That is to say, some educators would seriously maintain that through Chamorro language education of 30 minutes daily and through arts and crafts, they can counteract the effects of mass media, consummerism and technology run riot. Moreover, in addition to being a solution for psychocultural problems, the programs are supposed to maintain Chamorro-ness on the island and provide a vehicle for ethnocultural catharsis. These burdens are not only unrealistic but unfair to bilingual education. It is yet another example of how educational programs are expected to solve problems they didn't create nor have any control over.

The third point is that those individuals who are most nationalistic or concerned about cultural survival in the island societies become active in bilingual education. This makes bilingual education appear to be overtly political. However, this is not a function of bilingual education, but rather a function of the first point. Nationalists want to promote ethnocultural solidarity. Those who wish to promote such sentiments find bilingual education as the only vehicle. It would be grossly inaccurate to say that bilingual education is being utilized solely for nationalistic

purposes. It is, however, the only current legitimate route for cultural nationalists in the Marianas. As such, there is a tremendous amount of emotional commitment to the programs. However, this commitment must be reinforced continually in order to maintain interest in bilingual programs. Since many bilingual educators draw their spirit from this ethnocultural nationalism, some program activities take on a vitriolic tone which generates opposition.

This phenomenon also means that the bilingual educator as nationalist offers a non-pedagogical defense of bilingual education. Almost by definition, nationalistic educators see those in opposition as inauthentic members of the ethnic culture. Opponents are not just people who differ, they are unwitting mental prisoners of the oppressor at best and dastardly enemies of the people at worst.

In terms of the Woodward/Inglehart and Fishman analyses, Guam's situation can be understood, but not fully comprehended. Concern over language is supposed to be most serious in those linguistically-diverse areas which are in the process of rapid development. In these times of economic change and high expectations of social mobility, membership in certain language groups may facilitate such mobility. If that language belongs to a dominant minority and serves as a gatekeeper, the concern over language will reach new emotional heights. This description fits Guam (with a few adjustments) and with the rapid development of the Northern Marianas, Guam's northern neighbors may not be far

behind.

The Woodward/Inglehart analysis applies to Guam if proper consideration is given to the nature of institutions in developing, yet colonial societies. As a colonial area, Guam has "borrowed" modern institutions. These institutions draw their ethos and models for comparisons from whence they were borrowed. Since these institutions did not evolve from Guam history, but were rather transplanted to the island at various points in its distant and recent past, the institutions (particularly schools) may not be pursuing "local" agendas. Modern schooling on Guam is an American phenomenon. It pursues "American" agendas (including the emphasis on English as the gateway to success) regardless of how many "Americans" or "non-Americans" are ostensible operating the system. The intricate networks of accrediting agencies, professional associations, consultant firms, federal funds and regulations all work towards assuring that the institutions behave in a not too atypical fashion when viewed from a mainland U.S. perspective. In this sense, the agents who advertise English as a gatekeeper need not be overbearing Anglos, assimilated Chamorros or a "foreign" capitalist class. The schools, by their very nature, give that message. The gate may in fact be more perceived than real and the enemies of Chamorro may be more internal than external. Nevertheless, the rapid changes in economic and social life have brought increased attention to language and its role in society, which would not be present <u>if</u> there were no changes and there was no expectation of mobility.

In terms of Fishman's analysis of the nationalistic uses of language, all the trademarks of Chamorro nationalism can be found in the emerging school language policies of Guam. Appeals to a glorious past and ethnocultural authenticity are frequently addressed in terms of language. Additionally, the behavior of many bilingual educators and involvement in political issues make their nationalist sentiments apparent. Finally, we find that the government has taken only limited action in non-school circles to support Chamorro as a vehicle to ethnocultural solidarity.

I do not wish to imply that a nationalist revolution is brewing on Guam nor do I wish to convey the impression that there is unanimous support of Chamorro language or bilingual forms of education. Taking William Mackay's maxim that only before God and linguists are languages equal, it is relatively easy to see that English still has and will continue to enjoy a privileged position. However, the meteoric rise of concern over Chamorro does merit attention and analysis.

In conclusion, this language and cultural resurgence has, and will continue, to generate hard issues in both Guam and the Northern Marianas which all people at the crossroads must confront. Languages become tools in these issues not because of their widespread use or existence as communication impediments, but because they have been correctly identified as symbols of peoplehood. For the Chamorros, who have historically been denied symbols or loaned the of other peoples' symbols, the recognition of something unique and

authentic is a form of mental liberation.

The inescapable conclusion is that in developed Pacific areas such as Guam, the use of language in educational systems is evaluated far less for its educational value than for its use in defining the essence of a society that is experiencing troubled times. It is a vehicle to maintain the happy vision of days gone by as well as a tool for demonstrating political and group clout. Developed Pacific areas will engender a highly developed sense of nationalism. For Guam, the long-term chance of success for the nationalism (and the use of Chamorro in expressing it) may be slim and matter little in a thousand years. Nevertheless, at this stage of Guam's development, no other social and political strategy seems to make sense for any self-respecting Chamorro.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES

[1]Chamorro is the indigenous language of the Marianas. It is an Austronesian language closely related to Philippine languages, most notably Tagalog and Ilokano. See Donald Topping, Chamorro Reference Grammar (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1973), p. 4.

[2]Pacific Daily News, 9 Sept. 1977
A delegate to the island's constitutional convention voted to make Chamorro the only official language because 75% of the children don't know it.

[3]See almost any proposal for Title VII, ESEA funding. The Guam Bilingual-Bicultural Education Program, K-9 - 1979-1982 Proposal is a good example.

[4]See Carol Odo, A Survey of Language Use and Attitudes on Guam (Agana, Guam: Guam Department of Education, 1972). She reports that English monolingualism is rapidly growing among the young. It is also worthwhile to note that the English spoken on Guam reflects a great deal of Chamorro influence.

[5]R. F. Ingelhart and M. Woodward, "Language Conflicts and Political Community, "in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Giglioli (New York: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 359.

[6]Ibid., p. 372

[7]Joshua Fishman, Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972), p. 43

[8]Ibid., p. 71 and p. 84

[9]Ibid., p. 71

[10]Roy James, "The Island Possession of Guam," in America's Pacific Dependencies (New York: American Institute of Pacific Relations, 1949), pp. 79-80.

[11]Department of Commerce, Guam Annual Economic Review, 1980, (Agana, Guam: Government of Guam, 1979), p. 5, 58

[12]Ibid., p. 63

[13]Department of Commerce, Guam Statistical Abstract 1974 (Agana, Guam: Government of Guam, 1974), p. 24

[14]Guam Annual Economic Review 1980, p. 117. and Guam Statistical Abstract 1974, p. 24

[15]Guam Annual Economic Review 1980, p. 13-14

[16]U.S. Dept. of Commerce, News, July 29, 1981 (CB81-128)

[17]This is based on the nature of the campaign rehetoric for a approval of the covenant between the N. Marianas and U.S.

[18]Pacific Daily News, 2 May 1978, p. 6

[19]Ibid.

[20]"Chamorro is a Living Vibrant Language," P.D.N. April 16, 1974, p. 22. Quote attribute to Dr. George Riley, a University of Gua linguist.

[21]Katherine Aguon, "Guam's Educational Dilemma," Islander (P.D.N. Sunday News Supplement), May 13, 1979, p. 4

[22]"Education: the Basis of Progress," Guam Recorder, I (Feb. 1925), p.3

[23]"English in the Schools of Guam," Guam Recorder, I (Feb. 1925), p. 3

[24]Civil Affairs Handbook: Mandated Marianas Islands (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, 1944), pp. 115-117

[25]Don Topping "Spoken Chamorro Tomorrow" Guam Recorder (2nd series) III (Jan. - March, 1973), p. 46

[26]Ibid.

[27]The Bilingual Education Act (Rosslyn, Va: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Ed., 1979), p.3

[28]"What Parents Should Know About Bilingual Education," Guam Dept. of Education Brochure, 1971.

[29]The Guam Bilingual Education Project: A Review and Prospectus (Agana, Guam: Dept. of Ed., 1971), unpaged.

[30]Guam Bilingual-Bicultural Education Program K-9, 1979-1982 Proposal, (Agana, Guam: Guam Dept. of Ed.), pg. 8-9.

[31]Odo, p. 13

[32]Monika Kehoe, "English on Guam," Guam Recorder (2nd Series) III (Jan. - March, 1973), p. 43

[33]See Kolehion Mandikike' Project Brochure, 1973

[34]Final Report on Bilingual Education on Guam (Portland, Ore: Northwest Regional Ed. Laboratory, 1975), p. 4

[35]Emergency School Aid Act Continuation Proposal for Fiscal Year 1977 (Agana, Guam: Guam Dept. of Ed., 1976), p. 4

[36]ESAA Project: Chamorro Language and Culture Program (Agana, Guam: Guam Dept. of Ed., 1977), p. 16

[37] Cornelius J. Vander Poel, Guam, In Search of Its Own Identity, Vol. I. (Agana, Guam: University of Guam Social Science Institute), p. 331

[38] Pacific Daily News, July 21, 1978, p. 17a Quote attributed to Dr. Samuel Betances.

[39] Bureau of Planning, Kabales Na Planu Guahan (Agana, Guam: Government of Guam), p. 68

[40] In a Debate broadcasted over KUAM-TV, Aug. 1, 1979 in Guam.